Now we consider each set of variables in turn. It is important to remind the reader that the effects we report for each variable are independent or "net" of the effects of all of the other variables in our models, including the control variables listed in Tables 1a and 1b.

Expenditures by Function. As Table 2 indicates, the level of *regular classroom instruction* did not exert a significant effect on the average EOC scores of students overall, but higher spending on regular classroom instruction did correlate with higher average EOC scores for disadvantaged students. An additional $1000 spent on regular instruction translated into about 0.3 additional points on educationally disadvantaged students' average EOC scores – a modest but significant effect. In an earlier study, we did find that expenditures for regular instruction had a significant positive effect on EOC performance for all students, but our present model controls for the assignment of teachers to particular classes of students (Henry, Thompson, and others, 2008). The difference between the two studies is likely to be explained by the fact that higher performing students get the most experienced and most highly qualified teachers which is already taken into account in the estimates for this study.

It is actually not surprising that additional regular classroom expenditures have an effect on educationally disadvantaged students but not on students in general, even after controlling for the teacher-student assignment to classes. As we expressed the matter in our report on the High School Resource Allocation study, two broad types of resources shape how much students learn: the resources that students bring to school, and the resources that the school brings to students. By definition, educationally disadvantaged students bring lower reading and mathematics skills with them into high school. So it would be reasonable to expect that high schools would need to provide them with more instructional resources than other students would need in order to reach the threshold required to support proficient performance in high school courses. Our results show that when high schools do provide the additional resources for regular classroom instruction, those additional resources do pay off.

Table 2: Explaining the Effects of DSSF on High School Student Achievement: Class Size;
            Per pupil Expenditures; teacher Quality; and Teacher Pay

	All students Coefficient	EOC IMPACT	Disadvantaged Students Coefficient	EOC IMPACT
Net Effects Model- DSSF Indicator Coefficient -No Mediators	**0.1646****	1.4751	**0.0866***	0.5545
DSSF Indicator Coefficient for Mediator Class Size	**0.1651****	1.4797	**0.0867***	0.5555
Class Size	**-0.0015****	-0.0142	-0.0002	
DSSF Indicator Coefficient for Mediator Expenditures (in hundreds)	**0.1570****	1.4069	**0.1052****	0.6737
Regular Classroom Instruction	0.0019		**0.0045****	0.0290
Special Instruction	0.0051		0.0039	
Professional Development	**-0.0723****	-0.6482	-0.0309	
Supplemental Instruction	**-0.0156***	-0.1401	**-0.0221***	-0.1415
Student Services	-0.0081		-0.0077	
Technology	0.0070		0.0003	
School Leadership	-0.0078		0.0013	
LEA Instruction Expenditures	-0.0000		-0.0000	